FILED 10/30/2019 Court of Appeals Division I State of Washington

## IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON DIVISION ONE

S. MICHAEL KUNATH,	No. 79447-7-I
Respondent/Cross Appellant,	) )
V.	
CITY OF SEATTLE,	
Appellant/Cross Respondent,	) ) )
ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY INSTITUTE,	) ) )
Appellant/Cross Respondent,	) ) )
SUZIE BURKE, an individual; GENE BURRUS and LEAH BURRUS, as individuals and the marital community comprised thereof, PAIGE DAVIS, an individual; FAYE GARNEAU, an individual; KRISTI DALE HOOFMAN, an individual; LEWIS M. HOROWITZ, an individual; TERESA JONES and NIGEL JONES, as individuals and the marital community comprised thereof; NICK LUCIO and JESSICA LUCIO, as individuals and the marital community comprised thereof; LINDA R. MITCHELL, an individual; ERIKA KRISTINA NAGY, an individual; DON ROOT, an individual; LISA STERRITT and BRENT STERRITT, as individuals and the marital community comprised thereof; and NORMA TSUBOI, an individual,	
Respondents,	

٧. CITY OF SEATTLE, a municipality; SEATTLE DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES, a department of the City of Seattle; and FRED PODESTA, Director of the Seattle Department of Finance and Administrative Services, in his official capacity, Appellants. DENA LEVINE, an individual, CHRISTOPHER RUFO, an individual; MARTIN TOBIAS, an individual; NICHOLAS KERR, an individual; CHRIS MCKENZIE, an individual, Respondents, ٧. CITY OF SEATTLE, a municipal corporation, Appellant. SCOTT SHOCK; SALLY OLJAR; STEVE DAVIES; JOHN PALMER, Respondents, ٧. CITY OF SEATTLE, a Washington municipal corporation,

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION AND REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Appellant.

Respondents Levine and Burke filed a motion for reconsideration of the opinion filed July 15, 2019. The panel requested and received answers from appellants City of Seattle and Economic Opportunity Institute. The panel also accepted a reply from Levine and Burke, who requested oral argument. The panel has determined that the motion for reconsideration and the request for oral argument be denied.

Now therefore, it is hereby

ORDERED that respondents Levine and Burke's motion for reconsideration is denied. It is further

ORDERED that the request for oral argument is denied.

FOR THE PANEL:

Verellan J